NOT TO BE TAKE
FROM THE LIBRA

378.744
BO
1922 A.M.
hi

Percy M. Hickcox 1922

Boston University
College of Liberal Arts
Library

THE GIFT OF Percy Merriman Hickcox

September 1922 No.

Upstairs
378.744
BO
1922
A.M.
hi

*3806½	10½ x 8	6 13/16
3810	11 x 8½	6 13/16
*3810½	11 x 8½	6 13/16
*3810¾	11 x 8½	8½

*One Inch Rings

NATIONAL BLANK BOOK CO.
Factory: HOLYOKE MASS.
NEW YORK CITY CHICAGO, ILL.
MADE IN U. S. A.

P 1221

OUTLINE

Introduction

a) importance of the problem of the Resurrection p.1
b) approach to the subject 2
c) place of the Resurrection in modern criticism 4

I. The Belief Of The Early Church

a) effect of the Resurrection upon the disciples 5
b) question of the Resurrection of the body 6
c) testimony of St. Paul 7
d) account rendered by Peter 10
e) belief of the Apostolic Fathers 12
i. Epistle of Polycarp 13
ii. Epistle of Ignatius 13
iii. Tertullian Against Marcion 14

II. A Critical Survey Of The Various Texts

a) dependence of Matthew and Luke on Mark 15
b) the work of Mark 16
c) details found in Matthew and not in Mark 17
d) the especially Lukan narrative 18
e) narrative in Acts bearing on the problem 20
f) narratives of the Resurrection in St. John 21

III. Attempts At Some General Conclusions

a) reconstruction of Professor Lake 22
b) view of his general conclusions 25
c) interpretations of Professor Orr 28
d) estimates and explanations of Simpson 31
e) the work of Latham 32
f) conclusions of Wendt on this subject 32
g) an observation of Holtzmann 33
h) differences and agreement of Shaw 35
i) the heart of Harnack's study 36
j) Kent's estimate of the living Christ 39

IV. Criticism Of Some Unsatisfactory Attempts

a) naturalistic views 40
b) inadequacy of mythological and similar views 41
c) the supernatural view 42

V. Conclusions

a) the central and common conclusion 42

P1221

Upstairs
378.744
B1
1922. A.M.
hi

b) meeting the demand for a spiritual reality 44
c) general acceptance of St. Paul 45
d) spiritual view is in keeping with life of Christ 46
e) our approach has been the purely Christian way 49
f) conclusion depends on one's whole-world view 50
g) here we rise above a mere textual criticism 51

Summary

THE RESURRECTION OF JESUS.

The resurrection of Jesus is one of the most vital and all embracing questions which can be raised in connection with His life and work. The primary testimony of the disciples of Jesus was that they had seen the resurrected Master, and that He had in His own person communicated to them the great mission which they bore to the world. This it was, which impelled the disciples to leave their sorrowing for their departed Friend, and to devote themselves henceforth to the preaching of a risen Saviour of men. With energetic teaching concentrated on this one theme, the Christian Church was founded. Nothing else could have given it the impetus which its early founders obtained in this citadel of unwavering faith. According to the view of Denney "Nothing that Jesus was or did, apart from the resurrection, can justify or sustain the religious life which we see in the New Testament." So likewise Strauss speaks of the "crowning miracle of the resurrection - - that touchstone - - of Christianity itself." To this testimony might be added the conviction of Wellhausen, "The resurrection was the foundation of the Christian faith," or the assurance of Burkett as to the importance of the event in history when he says,"There is no doubt that the Church of the Apostles believed in the resurrection of their Lord."

The best evidence for the resurrection is not available for our direct use. That which made itself

manifest to the senses of the disciples is an event in history which cannot be reproduced for our investigation. The statements of the earliest writers, however, are at hand and will bear close scrutiny. But before beginning a more close and detailed study of the problem, it is well to consider with what mind we shall follow our course. Some begin with the hypothesis that the resurrection is impossible, and usually end at the place where they began. But, as Denney is careful to point out, "reality is larger than individual intelligence" and a perusal of the truth of the problem is good for the most uncertain minds. Harnack distinguishes between the Easter Faith and the Easter message, showing his lack of concern for that which presents a gigantic problem to the minds of those who see the real importance attached to the conclusion of a careful study of the resurrection.

Too many begin their study of this problem with the confusing reports of the Gospel narratives, and from the outset are led into skepticism in regard to the whole historical background, [illegible]. It is far preferable to begin with the fact that the resurrection was believed and preached by the early disciples and that it was a powerful factor before these Gospels were ever reduced to writing. The life of this powerful current flows with unabated force thru the pages of the New Testament, and throbs with life

which demands the closest attention. The hard logic of Mill cannot easily be set aside, "Once admit a God, and the production, by His direct volition, of an effect which in any case owed its origin to His creative will, is no more a purely arbitrary hypothesis to account for the past, but must be reckoned with as a serious possibility."* Not only the existence of the early Church with all its momentum, but also that of the Church today, sustained by some unquestionable power all through the centuries, must also be considered as part of the indestructable evidence. As the rushing, whirling waters below the great falls at Niagara bear undeniable testimony to the existence of the mighty falling waters with all their strength above, so the existence of these phenomena must be born in mind as we pursue the study of the data which comes to our attention.

There was a time in the earlier history of Christianity when the resurrection was considered an immovable corner-stone to the Christian faith. As the years passed it became the center of some controversy, for it became evident that it was the center of the stronghold of the new and conquering faith. It was debated in the days of Justin Martyr, and later, from Reimarius to Strauss, the stream of criticism flowed with greater volume. By many Strauss has been considered one of the most dangerous opponents of the belief. Nevertheless, the strong appeal

*(Mill's "Logic", Bk. III, Chapt. 25)

of the life and personality of Jesus and the conviction on the part of many that his criticisms were faulty, has maintained the problem to the present. Though the state of the attack is now greatly changed, the interest in the question has the same vital force. Grounds of belief which were formerly thought unassailable, have now become the subjects of serious question. In the light of new and more scient - ific knowledge, even the method of dealing with the evidence has now been challenged.

Our attention is here turned to the personality of Christ. Was He truly historical? it will be asked by many. The acceptance of the resurrection narratives means that the modern mind must accept the performance of at least one miracle. In fact, the proofs of Christ's resurrection are incomparably greater than those of any other miracle. Here must be fought the decisive battle which pertains to the working of miracles in the universe. This resurrection miracle is the Gibralter of all miracles. If it cannot be found tenable all others too must fall. Moreover, repugnance to the miracle is the average attitude of the man of the world today. Strauss could admit of no such possible "interruption" in the chain of causes and effects in the cosmic order and regularity. Such an attitude as this on the part of many thinking men is due to the emphasiswhich is placed in our modern day upon the

scientific study of the universe.

Painstaking search and attention to detail by modern scholars has added to the accumulation of critical material very extensively. Such, says Orr, "furnish ready aids to the disintegration of the text and the evaporation of its historical contents." (p.19) In addition to this angle of approach, there is another fusillade of attack from the field of comparative religion and mythology. This advance aims at explaining any given religion from the circumstances of its environment. It basis its position entirely on the old Babylonian legends which have been studied out of their antiquity within recent years. If its work has succeeded in shaking the faith of some, there are among those who who are led on with its argument a number with Harnack, who maintain faith only in a spiritual interpretation of the Easter message. These at least will not be shaken from their belief that some manifestation of the risen Christ was made to those who speak so unanimously of His appearances.

The belief of the early Church - that early body of followers who lived so near the events in question and many of whose number had had close association with those who claimed to have seen the risen Lord - is an important step in the development of this subject. The conviction of this body beyond all question is that

scientific study of the universe.

Painstaking search and attention to detail by modern scholars has added to the accumulation of critical material very extensively. Such, says Orr, "furnish ready aids to the disintegration of the text and the evaporation of its historical contents." (p.49) In addition to this angle of approach, there is another fusillade of attack from the field of comparative religion and mythology. This advance aims at explaining any given religion from the circumstances of its environment. It basis its position entirely on the old Babylonian legends which have been studied out of their antiquity within recent years. If its work has succeeded in shaking the faith of some, there are among those who who are led on with its argument a number with Harnack, who maintain faith only in a spiritual interpretation of the Easter message. These at least will not be shaken from their belief that some manifestation of the risen Christ was made to those who speak so unanimously of His appearances.

The belief of the early Church - that early body of followers who lived so near the events in question and many of whose number had had close association with those who claimed to have seen the risen Lord - is an important step in the development of this subject. The conviction of this body beyond all question is that

the resurrection was a true miracle. At this point in the discussion Strauss is very frank, "Here then we stand on that decisive point where, in the presence of the accounts of the miraculous resurrection of Jesus, we either acknowledge the inadmissibility of the natural and historical view of the life of Jesus, and must consequently retract all that precedes, and so give up the whole undertaking, or pledge ourselves to make out the possibility of the result of these accounts, i.e., the origin of the belief of the resurrection of Jesus, without any corresponding miraculous fact." It is certain that the early Christians made no distinction between the Easter Message and the Easter Faith. The appearances to the women in John 20:14-18, Mk.16:9 and Matt. 28:9-10, to the apostles in Luke 24:36, John 20:19-29 and Mark 16-14, and to the apostles on the road to Emmaus - Luke 24:13 f., and to the disciples in Gallilee - Matt. 28:16, John 21 - speak of a person who has risen in the body which in some respects is identified with that which was crucified.

In the Gospel of Luke there stand out three cardinal features: a) the empty tomb, b) the message to the women, and c) the word brought through them to the waiting disciples. Mary Magdalene, and after her Peter and John, find the empty tomb. A physical resurrection is the only kind which their minds would accept. Any Jewish expectation would

have been fulfilled by a resurrection such as that which Lazarus experienced through the miraculous power of Jesus. A body subject to all the previous limitations of life and death, would have answered their understanding of a resurrection. The risen Jesus seemed to be released from some of the conditioning factors which bound Him in the days when He walked with the disciples. (Matt. 28:2 and John 20:25) He could now pass through closed doors, and could be present at no great interval in different and distant places.

It is Luke, also, who goes to the extreme of the narrators in presenting the materialistic aspect of the risen Lord. In this, however, he is but giving expression to a condition of the resurrection of Christ which all of the early Church accepted. No doubt his statements that Jesus partook of food when with the disciples on the shore of Galilee - Luke 24:41 and Acts 10:41 - were written out of his intense earnestness to make the matter understood beyond all doubt to readers. Indeed, it was upon the reality and the identity of His risen body that Jesus also had to insist; the difference was evident enough to all. Tho not presented in such a materialistic manner, all the other appearances of the resurrected Jesus speak of Him in the bodily form. Thus the Christian Church in the past has turned almost conclusively to these Gospel narratives for the record of

the Resurrection. This tendency is easily explained, for they furnish the natural conclusion of the Gospel story. For the early and direct evidence, however, we turn to the testimony of Paul. His first letter to the Corinthians is one of the earliest and most unquestioned epistles, written in the first quarter century after the death of Jesus and after this great apostle to the Gentiles had had ample opportunity, as he states in Galatians 1:19 to learn from Peter and James, the brother of Jesus, the details regarding the events immediately following the death of Jesus. Here Paul tells us that three years after his conversion he went up to Jerusalem expressly "to visit Cephas" (Galatians 1:8), that he stayed there a fortnight, and that there he saw James. The verb implies a "careful and searching inquiry on Paul's part." (Edersheim, Life and Times of Jesus, the Messiah p.222) As Schmiedel acknowledges,"during this fifteen days' visit to Peter and James, he had the best opportunity to perfect his knowledge on this subject."

Moreover, the subject was of the greatest interest to Paul and the center of his subsequent teaching. He embodied in all his works not only that which he learned through conversation with others, but alsohis own personal experience. Here Paul's account and interpretation is all the more significant because of his entire independence and because in many respects it is at variance with those accounts

in the Gospels. This witness of Paul speaks of six appearences to various disciples or groups of whom Paul himself is the last. Its exact designation of time and order imply that it is correct as far as we can attain knowledge of the period in which it was written. The Gospel records, with the accounts of appearances to the women, to Mary Magdalene, to the travellers to Emmaus, and to theseven at the seaof Tiberias, were not committed to writing until thirty or fonty years after the events which they record, thus allowing time for the incorporation of details which may be nothing more than tradition. With the accounts of Paul it is different. Here we have a written account produced within twenty-two or three years of the event (taking the date of 1.Corinthians as A.D.55). With these records we are dealing with first hand sources. "The number and the variety of the persons to whom the manifestations were made, as well as the character and status of the witnesses and the simultaneous perception by many, make the statement of evidence for the Resurrection which cannot be made light of by the impartial historian." (J.M.Shaw, The Resurrection of Christ, p. 23).

Further it is significant that Paul describes the appearance of these other disciples in precisely the same terms as he does the Lord's appearance to him on the road to Damascus. This is his key to the interpretation of all

the facts underlying the versions. (Galatians 1:11) "Am I not an apostle, have I not seen Jesus our Lord?") Even here Shaw, who contends for the bodily resurrection, says, "And however the phenomena perceived by his senses were to be described, what is important to note is the immediate effect that the appearings had on him, for St. Paul himself in his accounts of it is concerned with the significance of the fact rather than with any precise descriptive details. Thru it he became absolutely convinced that the Jesus who was crucified and whose followers he was persecuting was indeed the Risen and Exalted Lord." (Κύριος) p. 40 f. Of the belief of this apostle, then, there can be no doubt. The body of Jesus was changed from one of flesh and blood to one which was spiritual, incorruptible, and immortal. (Romans 8:11) "If the spirit of Him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwelleth in you, He that raised up Jesus Christ from the dead shall give life also to your mortal bodies thru His spirit that dwelleth in you." Likewise in verse 23 we read: "-But ourselves also, who have the first fruits of the spirit, even we ourselves, waiting for our adoption, to wit, the redemption of our bodies."

In "The First Interpreters of Jesus" (p. 16), Gilbert too finds the best of the evidence in the works of St. Paul. To the early disciples the resurrection of Jesus was the last and supreme evidence of His Messiahship. They, he

continues, had found the Messiah largely thru the historical Jesus; "he (Paul) found the historical Jesus thru the Messiah." With Paul the proof of the resurrection was the beginning of faith. The message of Paul is always the inference he drew from the Resurrection. "This was for him the fulfilment of God's revelation, and hence the fact that was to revolutionize the world as it had revolutionized his own spirit." (P.17) This is borne out in a close observation of all the apostle's letters. The very name for the Lord which Paul uses is a source of evidence. The most common form and the one found in the greatest variety of combinations is "Christ", the Greek equivalent of Messiah. This is used with the article eighty times, and without, onehundred and twenty-six times. The use with the article is that earlier form which was used in connection with the issue as to whether Jesus was the prophesied Messiah, as when John the Baptist said, "I am not the Christ" (John 1:20). It is a sort of official designation. Paul alone of the New Testament writers puts the name "Christ" first, using it a little more often than the form "Jesus Christ". This order, says Gilbert, accords well with the unique experience of this apostle. It is due to his vision of the Christ on the road to Damascus, an "epitome of apostolic faith", as Gilbert indicates, and "the nucleus of his practical theology". It may further be noticed that Paul does not speak of the

authority of the historical Jesus, i.e. he makes no allusion to the baptism, etc., which is so prominent in the Synoptic Gospels, nor does he allude to the claim which Jesus Himself laid to unique authority, i.e. to work miracles, to forgive sin, to bestow life, and to judge men. Thus, thruout all St. Paul's writings wherein he argues for the resurrection of the righteous, he proceeds from this all important resurrection of Christ.

In a like manner thru the pages of the New Testament we find writer after writer laying the fundamental basis of his faith on the Resurrected Christ. In first Peter, after the preliminary words, the author comes to the fact of history which stirs his soul most deeply, namely, the Resurrection of Jesus and the living hope that it begets. He tells his readers that God raised Jesus from the dead and gave Him glory, so that their faith and hope might be in God, (1:21) and that the Resurrection helped them to have true faith in God, and so a living hope. He further states that his readers were brought to God by the death of Jesus, but not indeed by it alone, but accompanied by the Resurrection. (3:21). In Hebrews, likewise, the early life of Jesus, and even his death, are not regarded as part of his high priestly service, but simply as a preparation for it. That is, Jesus was perfected to serve as high priest by His suffering and death, but that entrance thereto cannot be put

earlier than the Resurrection.

In spite of the evidence of St. Paul, it is enlightening at this point to observe how the belief of the Apostolic Fathers followed that of the New Testament Gospel writers. In the Epistle of Polycarp we read, "Wherefore, girding up your loins, serve the Lord in fear and truth, as those who have forsaken the vain, empty talk and error of the multitude, and believed in Him who raised up our Lord Jesus Christ from the dead, and gave Him glory, and a throne at His right hand. To Him all things in Heaven and on earth are subject. Him every spirit serves." p.70 By general consent among scholars, we have in this letter an authentic production of the renowned Bishop of Smyrna. The date of the Epistle cannot be satisfactorily determined, though we are probably not far wrong if we fix it about the middle of the Second Century.

The Epistle of Ignatius to the Trallians says: (p.200) "Many bodies of the saints that slept rose, their graves being opened. He descended, indeed, into Hades alone, but He arose accompanied by a multitude; and rent assunder that means of separation which had existed since the beginning of the world, and cast down its partition wall. He also arose again in three days, the Father raising Him up; and after spending forty days with the apostles, He was received up to the Father." (Supposedly written at

Smyrna during the Bishopric of Polycarp.) Or again we might refer to Ignatius' Letter to the Smyrneans, as follows: "And I know that He was possessed of a body not only in His being born and crucified, but also I know that He was so after His resurrection, and believe that He is so now. When, for instance, He came to those who were with Peter, He said to them, 'Lay hold, handle me, and see that I am not an incorporeal spirit.' For a spirit has not flesh and bones, as ye see me have.' And He says to Thomas, 'Reach hither thy finger into the print of the nails, and reach hither thy hand, and thrust it into my side;' and immediately they believed that He was Christ. . And thus was He, with the flesh, received up in their sight unto Him that sent Him, being with that same flesh to come again, accompanied by glory and power." (p.242 f.)

In Tertullian against Marcion- (translated by P. Holmes. p.410) we find, "For Marcion does not in any wise admit the resurrection of the flesh, and it is only the salvation of the soul which he promises." So Tertullian even twists the words of Paul toward the end he has in mind: "Now this I say, brethren, that flesh and blood cannot inherit the Kingdom of God". "He means" says Tertullian, "the works of the flesh and the blood which in his Epistle to the Galatians, deprive men of the Kingdom of God." (Written A.D. 207)

* * *

Now that we have in mind the importance of this study in the light of present day thought and the varied interpretations put upon it by the early New Testament and Christian writers, we can spend a little time examining in more detail and more critically the material of the Synoptic Gospels. In the first place, it is evident even to the casual reader that the various Biblical accounts do not agree even in some rather broad considerations. Still closer study will show that the records are full of apparent discrepancies, if not of events which are utterly impossible. Some scholars have thought to construct a harmony of the Synoptic Gospels and John; such productions are helpful in our study but cannot be considered in the main successful in the attempt which they proposed to accomplished. Professors Orr and Lake have carefully analysed these narrative documents and made rather extensive comparisons of the various accounts. A perusal of their study at this point will cast much light on the constructive section which will follow.

Allen and Burkitt in dealing with this problem regard the "one solid result" of literary criticism, that Matthew and Luke are based fundamentally on Mark, but the widely divergent phraseology found in the narratives makes direct borrowing seem incredible. In the prologue to Luke,

the author himself tells us that he has "traced the course of all things accurately from the first" in order that Theophilus might "fully know". The agreement of Matthew and Luke against Mark gives rise to the belief in the "Ur-Marcus" of Burkitt, or to the belief in the earlier document called "Q". Where Luke and Matthew disagree against Mark, and it is probable that they had Mark before them, it becomes evident that our Mark was not dependent upon the "Q". Matthew and Luke somethimes agree in omitting, for no apparent reason, some detail recorded in Mark. So, likewise, the use of doublets in Mark would indicate several sources.

Professor Lake divides Mark's narrative of the resurrection of Jesus into six sections: The first is the burial, of which Matthew and Luke have only editorial changes, and the second is the visit at the tomb, of which Matthew and Luke give dependent accounts as usual. Here the account of Mark suggests the question as to who it was that rolled the stone away. Matthew has a tendency thruout to explain all by miraculous intervention. Thus this writer shows a development in the tradition. The third, which is the appearance of the young man at the tomb, has a number of variations in Luke and Matthew. The fourth has to do with the descent into Hades, which arose to meet a theological need and which must be considered unhistorical. The fifth section deals with the Ascension. Of this we have in early literature

only two full accounts - in Acts and in the Gospel of Peter. In the other documents we have no definite description of the event, tho in John and the longer conclusion of Mark we have references to it. From Mark 14:27 and 16:7 we learn that the original conclusion of Mark told of the flight of the disciples into Galilee and of the appearances of Jesus there. In Matthew and John (21) we have the appearances in Galilee - the same as those of Mark which have been lost.

In addition to these parallels in the Gospel there is much found in one writer which is not recorded by another. In relation to the resurrection there are five such to be found in Matthew: 1) the resurrection of the many saints - Matthew 27:52. There is no other trace of such a tradition in the New Testament. 2) The watch at the grave. This is not suggested in Mark, tho it is not inconsistent with Mark. 3) The angel at the tomb - 28:2 f. This great angel evidently replaces the young man of Mark. 4) The appearance of the Lord to the women - 28:8-9. 5) The appearances to the disciples in Galilee - 28:16-20. The Matthean redaction of Mark, the appearance to the women, is not found in any other early document. The wording of Mark at the place where Matthew brings in this event, plainly excludes it: "They said nothing to anyone." The appearance of the young man and of the great angel are probably the same incident thus recorded in two forms. It is a well

known fact that there was a tendency to give doublets when there were two traditions of one incident. Accordingly, it is probably true that the incident is only a secondary product of the Marcan tradition. The next division is likewise a probable redaction from the Marcan account. Since Matthew has thus far followed Luke fairly accurately, it is agreed that the Galilean appearances are very likely the substance of the lost conclusion of Mark. According to Matthew the eleven depart in a group for Galilee, whereas Mark sends them scattered and in despair. This may be the result of attempting to give a separate record of the traditional appearances in Galilee.

We next turn our attention to the account given by Luke and note the especially Lukan narrative. Up to the point of the experiences of the women at the tomb Luke follows Mark, but here he introduces parts which may be contributed independently to his work. The first is that of the experiences of the women at the tomb- 24:3 f. Here the women entered the tomb and looked for the body of the Lord. Two men, supernatural beings, there met them and talked with them. The second is the message of the two men to the women. The difference of this message is so great in this narrative that some think that Luke has preferred another tradition. The message is that Jesus, <u>in</u> Galilee, had foretold these events. (Luke 9:22 "The Son of Man must suffer many things,

and be rejected of the elders and chief priests and scribes, and be killed, and the third day be raised up." But Mark states that Jesus was going to appear in Galilee, and gives the account of the quotation from Luke as taking place near Caesarea Philippi. So the passage is especially Lukan, deliberately changed, as Denney thinks, to hold the theory of Mark that Jesus appeared only in Jerusalem.

The next distinctly Lukan event is the conduct of the women and the disciples. 24:8-11. This, as Lake indicates, is far different from the Markan message to the disciples, "who had not left Jerusalem and apparently did not intend to do so." The fourth is the appearance on the road to Emmaus - 24:13-35. Such is a clear statement of the material character of the body of the Lord and its identity with the body that was crucified. The fifth is the appearances to the assembled disciples in Jerusalem.- 24:36-43. This account of Jesus' eating the fish is in accord with the general trend of Luke, and as Denney thinks, does not at all destroy the belief in the resurrection. The sixth has to do with the speech of the Lord to the disciples in Jerusalem - 24:44-9. Luke was not acquainted with the familiar scenes of Christ and His ministry in Galilee, and very naturally centers the scenes of His resurrected activity in Jerusalem, the recognized center of the Christian community. The last passage has to do with the ascension - 24:50-3. Lake thinks

Westcott and Hort probably right in saying that the words, "and was carried up into Heaven, and they worshipped Him", are a Western non-interpolation." Thus Luke, now turned aside from the Marcan order, is concerned exclusively with Jerusalem and the events of the third day.

From the Gospel of Luke we naturally turn to his work recorded in the book of Acts for further study of the position assumed by this writer. Here we have, first, the ascension - 1:1-14. It occurs some forty days after the resurrection. Lake is of the opinion that Luke is now in possession of a later tradition than that of the time he wrote the Gospel. According to the deductions of Denney, Luke was unconscious of this discrepancy or he would have harmonized the two works. He proposes that in the latter part of his Gospel Luke seems to condense all within the space of three days because he fails to specify the time more definitely. The Acts also adds the appearance of Christ to the dying Stephen, but this cannot be considered more than a heavenly vision. Then the appearance to Paul on the road to Damascus is three times recorded: 9:1-9, 22:6-10,and 26:12-18. The differences in these records are only minor, such as would naturally occur in a retelling. These accounts Luke must have obtained from St. Paul; they give evidence not to a physical but to a spiritual manifestation.

From the Synoptics and this glance into the Pauline position,

we pass into the conception set forth in the Fourth Gospel. Orr observes that the tone of John "suggests a writer who has minute and accurate knowledge of the matters about which he writes - down even to the small details - and who means to be taken as a faithful witness.". The appendix of this Gospel - chapter 21 - Lake thinks was inspired by the knowledge of a tradition of the appearances of Jesus in Galilee. With this record of the burial of Jesus in the Gospel, we have added to our fund of knowledge on this topic that Jesus was buried by Joseph of Arimathea, a secret disciple of Jesus - 19:34 f. Other reports are first, that He was buried by the Jews that He might not hang on the cross over night, and second, that He was buried by Joseph and Nicodemus, who gave the body a full and costly burial. The next distinct account in John is that of the events at the tomb on the morning of the third day-20:1-18.

The account of the appearances in John are also centered about Jerusalem. 20:19-29 They are quite clearly the same incident related in Luke 24:3 ff. These appearances were first to the disciples without Thomas and then to them while he was there. The body of Jesus was flesh and blood in so far as it was tangible, and contained the scars of the crucifixion. But there are likewise Galilean appearances in John, but these seem to be in the appendix to the Gospel. They give testimony to the draught of fishes at the direction

of Jesus and of the restitution of Peter. This tradition of the draught of fishes seems parallel to Luke 5:4. Luke connects it with the call of, not the restitution of, Peter. Though the style of this so called appendix is Johannine, some think that it may be the lost conclusion of the Gospel of Mark.

* * *

We now leave the accounts rendered by the several individual writers, and turn to the attempts that have been made at some sort of synthesis from this analysis. An interesting reconstruction is made by Lake. Under four heads he considers the whole field. The first is of the burial. Of this there are two originals, the Markan and the Johannine. These agree in ascribing the burial to Joseph of Arimathea, and in placing the grave near the site of the crucifixion. In further detail - the nature of the tomb and the manner of the burial - the narratives are contradictory. In Mark the grave is hewn out of the rock, the body is wrapped unanointed in a shroud, and Joseph, a member of the Sanhedrin is the chief person involved in the burial of Jesus. Joseph is hardly a disciple, but is interested in this procedure because the rules of the Jews were still very strict about this fulfilling of the Law of Deuteronomy. In John the grave is a kind of Mausoleum and into it the body of Jesus was placed by two of His "Disciples". In Lake's

mind the Markan is the preferable choice. It is evidently the older, and after it the other accounts continued to develop. Such a development as we find in John is both clear and natural.

It is clear from the Gospels that the belief that Jesus would be raised from the dead was not common. It is impossible to find room for this in the earliest tradition. The account of the guard at the tomb came out of the earliest controversies in which Jews tried to assert that Christians had stolen the body of Christ. This story arose as a natural refutation. It was, in the words of Professor Lake, "a fragment of controversy".

The second event of the reconstruction is that centered about the tomb on the third day. Here no two accounts really agree. The traditional probability strongly favors Mark, and others fall into place in an intelligible tho complicated system of development. In regard to the places of the appearances, Luke and John preferred the Jerusalem tradition and so adjusted their writings to this end. After his characteristic manner, John spiritualizes the resurrection. It is to the Father to whom Jesus goes. It is at this point that Professor Lake fails to see much emphasis in Mark in regard to the empty tomb. He doubts the precise form which is here met. It seems to him that the empty tomb is only a "deduction" from the more definitely stated events of this section. Mark represents a nucleus of

history which folk-lore has developed. Here is no real description of the resurrection, and the "third day" is only implied. He affirms that the women did not see the empty tomb, but that they were informed by a young man of the events which had happened, and so returned to announce a message of the resurrection to the disciples. It is difficult, however, to think that such a power as Christianity could have its main issue arise from such a simple misunderstanding!

We now turn to the interesting events of the appearances of the risen Lord. In his enumeration Paul speaks of six: that to Peter, to the Twelve, to the five-hundred, to James, to all the gathered people, and finally to Paul himself. As recorded by Matthew, Mark and John, the place is in Galilee; but there are the records of the Jerusalem appearances according to Luke, the Acts, and John. Lake says that it is more probable that the disciples fled to Galilee, and later came back to Jerusalem only on the appearance of Jesus. It is true that there was the tendency in early Christian thought to emphasize Jerusalem. As time passed, both the disciples and all tradition became more connected with Jerusalem. In this manner the Gospel came to "squeeze" Galilee out of consideration entirely. This in no way argues that the appearances in Jerusalem were not historically possible.

The conclusions which Paul makes as to the character of the appearances of Christ are drawn from the doctrine of transubstantiation which he held. Although the Jerusalem narratives of Luke and John are of the "flesh and blood" type, the Pauline view is favored by most modern minds. Those who presented the physical and material resurrection accepted the earthy form of Jesus as the norm, and naturally so interpreted the substance of the risen Lord. Following these appearances we have the story of the Ascension. According to Professor Lake, this grew up out of a belief in a Heaven placed in the clouds above, and was based after a fashion on the story of Elijah in the Old Testament.

So this more careful study of the Gospels leads Professor Lake to conclude that the undoubted general belief of the early Christians implied the empty tomb. Today we believe that life after death is continuous with this existence. Many people would not welcome the thought of a resusitation of these poor bodies of the flesh. Thus the matter of the empty tomb is a puzzle to our modern minds, for we are aware that our material bodies remain in the earth. The women at least had drawn the natural conclusion that the tomb was empty, though not from examination. It is true that there is confusion among the redactors in presenting the events at the tomb. Lake's assertion that "the women were naturally in an overwrought state of mind - - and fled",

is psychologically possible. Our own interpretation of the event will depend largely on our interpretatinn of the physical resurrection and its possibility. Lake proposes to his own satisfaction that the women may have mistaken the tomb among the many probably there. Since Jesus in one of His appearances came through closed doors, the matter of the rolling away of the stone from the tomb seems to suggest an unnecessary miracle. He further suggests that the words of the young man to the women were something in this order, "He (Jesus) is not here, see the place where they laid Him", and that such was later interpreted as the direction of an angel's voice. Thus he concludes that it was natural for them to assert that they knew that the tomb was empty. Such a clever array of misunderstandings, however, is too brilliant to prove worthy of the truth in this case.

In regard to the third day, Professor Lake thinks that this was held from the beginning to be the day of resurrection because of the experience of the women which is connected with it. To him it seems to be merely an inference. The prophecies of the Old Testament had an important influence on this belief, though the references themselves are of a doubtful character. Then, too, the prophecies of Christ Himself are indicative of this day. But this can be explained away by those who hold that it is due largely to the explanation given by the early Church at the time of the

writing of the Gospels. Such a radical view finds some little support in the interpretation given in the Gospels to the long-looked-for Parousia. Mark 9:10 and 32 give some evidence that the disciples themselves looked for no such resurrection of their Lord. It might seem that Jesus spoke to His disciples about approaching death and ultimate victory in terms which they were not ready to understand clearly. Some of these seem to have been interpreted in one meaning and some in another. Finally, the contemporary Messianic belief with its traces of the "third day" has its place in this list.

Professor Lake's final conclusions are such as are readily acceptable by the modern earnest mind. He still believes that there was an actual manifestation of Jesus. There was indeed no hallucination; the affair was actual and even miraculous, but not so in the physical sense. Paul was the earliest written source of the resurrection of Jesus. Though no eye-witness, he was well acquainted with those who had seen the Lord before the time of His ascension. This apostle based all his evidence, not on the empty tomb, but on the manifestation of Christ. Here Professor Lake holds tenaciously to his position that the appearances to the disciples must have been subjective, and if they were such they could be interpreted by them in no other than in an objective manner. Death may be regarded as the release of an eternal personality from the limitations of an existence in time. The

physical resurrection, he further states, continually violates the best ascertained laws of physics, chemistry, and physiology, but such a super-normal psychological event as this appearance subjectively and not unmiraculously to the minds of the disciples, is quite possible. In our natural environment and in the limitations of our finite minds, all our greater visions, even though spiritual, must be couched in terms of the material. Thus it is concluded that the resurrection was subjective, but that the perception of the risen Lord, apart from the form which it took, was objective.

Professor Orr in his view of the problem of the resurrection is more conservative than Lake. Some general lines of his arguments are germane at this point. He feels that Paul himself was absolutely convinced, both at the time of his vision and ever after, of the reality of Christ's vision to him. This event became a turning point in the history of Christianity. In a like manner, Peter is so convinced when in his epistle he writes of the "Lord of Glory". In the evidence for the faith in the resurrection found in the new courage which came to the disciples, Professor Orr has a strong argument. The followers of Jesus had been lost in despair at the time of the crucifixion of their Master. They had repaired to their old tasks in Galilee and elsewhere to lead lives of simple people and

to forget, if possible, the loss of so great a friend. Now they are suddenly called back, and with a new and burning zeal, set about to carry forward the program which was inherent within the teaching of Jesus. So great was their enthusiasm that thousands of converts were made to a new and difficult cause. It seems probable that in the face of so marked success, the enemies of the disciples would have eagerly brought forth the body of Jesus from the tomb if it might have been obtained. Thus the empty tomb remains an unimpeachable witness of the truthfulness of the testimony of the disciples.

The resurrection phenomenom as explained by mere subjective visions is still the favorite of many. Visions in an emotional atmosphere, it is said, are very contagious. Such Paul's is pointed out to be. According to Renan, it was Mary Magdalene who set the train of visions going. He asserts that it was very natural for the disciples to have such visions after they had travelled to the old familiar sights of Galilee, and that it was also natural for such to die away after the excitement of the crucifixion and the dispersion of the band of twelve had subsided. In response to this, however, Professor Orr points out that there is no reason to believe that the disciples were expecting to see their Master. In these passages the resurrection had been foretold: Mark 8:31, 9:31, 10:34, 9:9, 14:28,

etc., but the resurrection of Jesus was clearly to be distinguished from His reappearance to His disciples. Thus it was on top of the deep incredulity of any such event that the appearances really did occur. Moreover, the "visions" of the resurrected Lord were not misty, flighty affairs, but were in cases long interviews. Nor were they with men of nervous temperament, but with hardened men of the sea and with a hard-headed tax-gatherer and a business man as we find in Matthew.

The proposed solution of the whole question as set forth by the "Resurrection Legend" of the mythological schools is worthy of passing observation. They propose that the Christian story was imported into Judaism from Babylonian myths and other similar Oriental sources. Thruout the Orient there is a common legend of the death and resurrection of a god based on Nature - the passing of winter and the advent of spring. So they remove the last particle of historicity from the Gospels and make Judaism and Christianity the outgrowths of these syncretistic religions. In simply trying to account for the legend they lose sight of the facts of the resurrection - the burial of Jesus, the empty tomb, and the appearances.

Such a method of explanation rests on arbitrary assumption. Says Professor Orr: "The Church knew its own religion, and could be under no vital mistake as to the

great facts on which its belief in Christ as its crucified and risen Lord rested." The apostles and evangelists are hardly thus to be taken as fools! Nor could those today who have felt the power of the resurrected Christ believe that such rested on a myth. Life is more than mere logic! The reality of the truth rests, not in systems of thought, but in the survey of human experience. The experience of countless thousands since the days of the apostles attest to the solemnity of this deeper and more convincing truth.

W. J. Sparrow Simpson in his work, "The Resurrection of Jesus in Modern Thought," does not agree with the avowed position of Professor Lake in the matter of the empty tomb. His assertion is that in spite of all the diversity which has been indicated above, we must finally admit that the narratives yield a uniform and very impressive tradition that the grave was empty on Easter morning. Such, he estimates, was required by the contemporary idea of the Resurrection in all Jewish thought. The idea of a Resurrection is inseparable from the interpretation of Daniel 12:12, II Maccabees 7:11, and John 5:28. He concedes, however, that such a view was not held by Saint Paul, who maintained that flesh and blood cannot inherit the Kingdom of God, and that we sow not the body that shall be. In II Corinthians 3:17 it is plainly held that the Risen Lord is a Spirit: "Now the Lord is a Spirit." In the light of these facts,

Simpson is driven to conclude either that Paul did not consider the empty tomb valuable, that he knew nothing about it, or that the idea was foreign to his conception. This, too, is the opinion of Holtzmann, "Life of Jesus", p. 499.

The inference of those who adhere to a subjective appearance of Jesus must be that Christ's buried body was dissolved if the evident manifestation of the empty tomb is correct. Some advocates of this theory contend that those interested in the Christ would not troop to the grave of the Master because such an act would lead to ceremonial defilement. They add that the search for the grave would have been unnatural, that if faith had already been convinced by personal experience they would not need the support of such an investigation. Wendt, on the other hand, is so certain that the grave of Christ was discovered to be empty, that he considers the incident providentially permitted. He shrinks from contemplating the reverence which all Christendom would otherwise have bestowed upon the relics of Christ. At least, he concludes that the empty grave was providentially designed to spiritualize and refine the character of the Christian religion. Simpson rests his evidence at the grave largely on his conviction that John's description of the visit of the two disciples to the tomb is most life-like and convincing. Latham's belief (p.3-4, The Risen Master) concerning the grave clothes upon which some rest consider-

able weight, is that John, "however" did go in, and that there he was startled by the observation that the grave clothes were lying flat. (ἐντετυλιγμένον-)

Holtzmann, again, is of the persuasion that Joseph of Arimathea on further reflection and for prudential reasons withdrew the body of the Lord from the grave in which he had at first for ceremonial reasons allowed it to rest. Whatever our view of this complex question of the empty grave, it is the goal of this paper to point out the reasonableness of the conclusion to which Simpson comes. We must finally assert, says he, either that all this was the result of human contrivance, or else that it was the work of God. "Two antagonistic conceptions of God and the world meet at the grave of Christ", is the manner in which he expresses himself. From all the evidence presented the writer of this survey is strongly inclined to believe with Wendt, i.e. that the modern belief of the exaltation of Jesus is independent of the question, "What is the nature of the disciples' experiences?" Even if the Appearances of the Risen Lord were the means by which the disciples reached their higher conceptions, they are entirely separable from these higher conceptions which may be perfectly valid apart from all consideration of the Appearances. A true conclusion may be reached thru mistaken premises. A flat denial of the objectivity of the Appearances would not

necessarily carry with it the denial of Christ's spiritual exaltation.

Finally, we must stand with Simpson when he asserts, (p. 446) "It is really of great importance that Christ's Resurrection cannot be made as certain as any other event in history. Belief in it must ultimately depend on a judgment of its worth. And that again will depend on our entire interpretation of life. It is inseparable from religious presuppositions." Or, in the thought of Hegel (Philosophy of History, II. 221), the Resurrection belongs eventually to the province of faith. With this conclusion of Simpson, all our best efforts conform, tho we do not hold with him to all his other conservative estimates. Nor can we swing to the opposite pole - to such a theory as Pfleiderer clings to in his "Philosophy and Development of History". He conceives of the Resurrection as the crowning event of the life of the Messiah, and lauds it as the crisis which tore the Jews away from their carnal hopes of the Kingdom, raising them to a higher world of faith and hope. Pfleiderer, too, sifts the witnesses of the Resurrected Lord down to Paul and Mark, and argues that "the particular grounds which actualized this possibility (of faith in the bodily resurrection) lay in the psychological state of the disciples of Jesus after the death of the Lord."(p.114) He lays much weight on the observation that it was Peter, "the man

of vivid feeling and of quickly excitable soul", who first came to the conviction that the crucified One was living. History of Religion, he asserts, has often furnished cases equally convincing as this. Somewhere between the crude physical fact which has been indicated as repulsive to the thoughtful mind, and the extreme view of an estimate like this of Pfleiderer our final conclusions must lie.

The study of J.M.Shaw in "The Resurrection of Christ" is enlightening all along the line of our interpretation, altho in his own position he, too, holds to the literal resurrection of the body of the Lord. The "reduced" or "attenuated" Christianity which is the outcome of the indifference to the bodily aspect of the Resurrection not only does less than justice to the apostolic thought, he contends, "but has serious consequences for our belief in the centrally determined and constitutive significance of the Resurrection of Christ for our view of the world and life, and in particular, for our belief in the ultimate subjugation of the entire material order to the purpose of spirit." (Preface) In the pursuit of this survey, Shaw agrees with the very theme of this paper, i.e. that the mere historical evidence will not alone lead to faith in the Risen Christ, but that all depends upon the religious attitude of heart and mind which we bring to our study. Tho the accounts vary, Shaw expresses his feeling in these words, " those critics who come

to negative conclusions do so less because of difficulties connected with the evidence than because of presuppositions of a dogmatic or philosophical character with which they come to the examination of the subject." (p. 10).

The establishment of the Church of Christ in its extraordinary spiritual vitality, Shaw asserts, demands a sufficient cause. While Shaw follows out the details of the Gospels in a manner which we shall review in a moment, he places his highest value and belief in the position of this paper, and quotes two authorities who agree with him in this fundamental conclusion. Westcott, in the "Gospel of the Resurrection,"[1] points out that the apostolic conception was "the Lord lives", rather than "the Lord was raised", i.e. that "Christ lives because He works still". If it were not for this fact continued in the present, the historical evidence would long since have faded. Thus, likewise, we have the statement of Harnack, in "What is Christianity?"[2] In any case, says he, "certain it is that what he (Paul) and the disciples regarded as all important was not the state in which the grave was found, but Christ's appearances." (p. 164). The position of Harnack is that what happened on that third day is insoluble from all the obtainable data.

In spite of this citation of the conclusions reached by Harnack, Shaw goes on to examine the evidence from his own point of view, agreeing with Swete that the

1. Westcott, Gospel of the Resurrection, p 132
2. p. 163

evidence for the empty tomb is "too notorious to be denied". With this author, too, he has faith in the records of the Johannine accounts. Concerning John's belief at the tomb, Swete says, "There arose in his mind at the moment a nascent confidence that in some way, as yet unknown, their darkness would be turned to light, and the victory of the Christ be secured." (Appearances, p. 6) Shaw then wrestles with the problem of the Appearances. The accounts of Mark are plainly unfinished, he observes, and the records thru all the Gospels must be recognized as fragmentary. The narratives do not primarily represent history, and we must agree with Milligan, "The Resurrection of our Lord" p.57, that "we do the Evangelists injustice when we regard them as witnesses in a court of law, who have been appointed to prove a fact, and who have deliberately taken it in hand to do so." With Denney (p. 155) we would prefer to state rather that both the Galilean and the Jerusalem appearances are right than that either are wrong.

Those who contend for the physical Resurrection cite the passages which seem in their estimates unqualifiedly to represent such fleshly appearings. Jesus bids the doubting Thomas to touch and handle His person to convince His unbelief, but we are not told that the disciple availed himself of the test. Even Denney rejects the idea of the risen Lord's "eating", and he too finds in Luke a "tendency

to materialize the spiritual" (p. 146). Even Shaw with his belief in the physical Resurrection admits from the evidence of his study that Christ did not come forth with the same body. "It had undergone some marvelous change," he says (p. 83.). It had "mysterious peculiarities" which distinguished it from the natural earthly body. He makes the following observations which seem to carry out the idea at least of a very strange sort of physical existence: The Risen Lord passed thru the closed sepulcher and thru a closed door (Luke 24:36); He could be present in distant places at apparantly short intervals (Luke 15:34); He appeared suddenly without any physical locomotion (John 20:19); and He disappeared suddenly (Luke 34:31, "He vanished from their sight".) This latter citation Shaw concedes to have been "a disappearance, not a spacial withdrawal." (p. 83)

From these observations and the fact that the disciples on the road to Emmaus did not recognize the Lord as He walked with them, Shaw is led to a theory which blends into the spiritual conception of the Resurrection before he is thru with his analysation of the Appearances of the Risen Lord. He is restrained in his belief in the physical nature of the Lord's body by the strange aloofness of His presence and His reserved attitude in which He spoke of the time "when I was yet with you" (Luke 24:44). The only solution which this

scholar finds adequate is that during the period of these appearances Jesus, in His intercourse with the disciples, was hovering between the old form and a new in a transitional condition, combining the seemingly opposite qualities of the material and the spiritual. This interpretation drives him to the position of Weisäcker, i.e. that we have in the Gospels two different layers of tradition. Such concession forces us to the conclusion that in His higher form of fellowship Jesus did appear in a very objective fashion to His disciples. They must of necessity interpret such visions in a sensuous manner, even tho in so doing they recognized that their changed Lord's body was no longer subject even to the limitations they were accustomed to observe in the days of His earthly existence with them.

In Kent's estimate of the Living Christ (in the "Life and Teachings of Jesus"), the usual evidence both of the Gospels and of the Pauline experience is pursued. Again, this author agrees with us that "the essential elements in the gospel narratives, after all, are what Jesus was and taught; and these corner-stones stand quite independent of the resurrection stories." (p. 300) He then points out the kind of a Resurrection which it was perfectly normal for these early writers to have faith in. The conception of any individual immortality in that day apart from the body was foreign to orthodox Jewish thinking.

Hence the Jewish Christians naturally thought of the possibility of Jesus' reappearing in no other manner. Herod believed that Jesus was John the Baptist returned to life. Thus we find that to the common people of Palestine, from whom the first and second generations of Christians came, the rising of the dead was not as marvelous as it seems today. In Kent's opinion Paul shows the influence of the Pharisaic doctrine of a bodily resurrection in his writings, but this apostle unequivocally rejects it as insufficient to explain his own belief. Paul therefore represents a transition from the material Jewish belief in the bodily resurrection to that purely spiritual conception of individual immortality which was the great contribution of the wisest thinkers of Greece.

* * *

From the supernatural view which we have studied and found, in some instances, shading off into what we have chosen to call the more pronouncedly spiritual type, we turn to a very cursory survey of the naturalistic theory - one to which it is scarcely worth while to turn aside. Keim advanced at one time what he called the objective hypothesis theory. His hypothesis is that while the body of Jesus remained in the tomb, His living Spirit sent telegrams to the disciples to assure them that He still lived. In such a presentation, however, Keim himself acknowledges that the

* * *

supernatural is not entirely eliminated. Another hypothesis that for a period was widely accepted is that Jesus did not truly die on the cross but that He had fainted and, in the haste of the Passover preparation ~~preparation~~, was placed in the tomb. He is then supposed to have revived and to have broken His way thru the sealed tomb. For a period He was in association with the disciples amidst the familiar scenes in Galilee. Finally, His wounds proved fatal and He took His departure from the group.

To some minds some such interpretations as these are alluring because of the explanation that they give of a bodily appearance, but they must at last fall. They are rejected by historical students because they do not take into consideration the evidence of Paul nor that of the older Gospel narratives, nor do they account in the least degree for the new life which burned in the hearts of the disciples. More fundamental than this, however, we must reject such theories because they are completely at variance with the character of Jesus.

In a like manner the hypothesis that Peter was under the influence of a hallucination and believed that he saw the Master, is open to the same criticism. In some psychological circles today the suggestion is advanced that what the disciples and others went thru is adequately and clearly explained as genuine psychical experiences. To the

mind of Sir Oliver Lodge this explanation is that which finally closes the discussion of the years. Such thinkers inform us that the whole question of the relation of the mind to the body and to the spirit has taken great steps forward in the light of the recent research and that its revelations are just started. Such an attitude seems to explain the distinction of Harnack between what he calls the "Easter message" and the "Easter faith". According to his reasoning, however, Christ's presence can be interpreted as nothing more than the manifestations of surviving personality. It is true that faith today is exercised in the Exalted and Glorified Lord, but it must rest ultimately on the historical fact that Christ was alive and active in the period immediately following the third day.

* * *

Having studied in some detail the data of our various narratives and testimonies, we have wended our way thru the net-work of reconstructions and interpretations of numerous scholars finally to rest in the one conclusion that seems to be common to nearly all the writers, namely, that the life and death and continued presence of Jesus were such that a living and vital faith in His Gospel is not only possible but commanding in this day. Says Shaw, "It is the fontal source or spring of the apostolic faith, that which brought the Church into existence, and set it moving with that won-

derful vitality and power which lie before us in the New Testament."[1] That Jesus had spoken as never man spake before would have left certain memoirs of His life, but a perusal of Peter's report in his preaching in the Book of Acts gives quite a higher conception of the Master. He starts indeed with the historical Jesus but his true emphasis and power are found in the conception of the Resurrected Savior. Thus the Resurrection is the fundamental determinative principle of the whole apostolic view of the world and life. Here too, says Shaw further, "God has convincingly manifested the supremacy of spirit over the strongest material forces."[2] Here is given the final pledge and assurance of personal immortality.

After all, the great miracle about the Resurrection is that God so purposed to reveal Himself thru His Son that Christ was made manifest to the senses of the disciples after some manner which was so convincing that they preached with tremendous effect. This impress of the personality of Jesus was so deep and strong that they saw Him after He died. Whatever criticism or psychology may have to add concerning our evidences, this must remain the deep and abiding secret of the "appearances". The real Resurrection with which we are vitally concerned today, the event which has meaning and importance for the soul's life, is the rising of Jesus out of death into the spiritual life with God. The true

1. "The Resurrection of Christ" p 1 f.

message of Easter is that Jesus passed out of death into life everlasting. With this supreme view it is difficult to understand why any will contend for the reanimation of the body of the Lord. The records must forever remain at best only evidential; they belong to the past and are forever closed. The episode of the third day is secondary; the manifestation of the changed and Risen Lord to the disciples alone is primary. The records of a bodily Resurrection utterly fail to meet the soul's demand. They tell us only of events inside the sensible realm, and cannot possibly prove anything further. Faith cries out for more. The demand for spiritual and ultimate reality cannot be met with anything less than an answer to the hungering spirit.

In closing we find ourselves once more turning to the master mind of Saint Paul. The oldest testimony of the Resurrection is from the pen of this apostle. I Corinthians 15 - probably written about 55 A.D. - teaches the earliest tradition. From this Denney infers that "if we cannot speak of a bodily Resurrection, we should not speak of a Resurrection at all." But soon after this even he admits that "Jesus does not come back to the old life at all. As risen, He belongs already to another world, and to another mode of being. . . . It was the manifestation, transcending nature, of new life from God." His words are well substantiated in those of Paul: "Like as Christ was raised from the dead

thru the glory of the Father, so we also might walk in newness of life. For if we have become united with Him by the likeness of His death, we shall be also by the likeness of His Resurrection. . . . If we died with Christ, we believe that we shall also live with Him; death no more has dominion over him."

It is clear from these and other references of Paul that it is the power of a spiritual resurrection which he stressed. The secret of the event Paul finds alone in the power of God. In his figurative fashion he sees that this is as possible and as likely as the springing up of the seed into a wholly different, fuller and larger form of life. The sowing of the seed is in corruption, the rising is in incorruption; it is sown inglorious but it rises in glory; it is sown in weakness but it rises in power; it is sown a natural body and it rises a spiritual body. Paul's experience on the Damascus Road is the natural key by which we interpret the historical material. II Corinthians 12:1-4 most convincingly allude to an inner and spiritual vision: "I must needs glory, tho it is not expedient, but I will come to visions and revelations of the Lord. I know a man in Christ fourteen years (whether in the body I know not or whether out of the body, I know not, God knoweth)." Certainly these words of our chief witness do not speak of necessity either for or against the bodily appearance, but they

do assert the certainty of Paul that he himself, in his inner consciousness, is aware that he met the Risen Savior. It is difficult for one to tell another the details of the inner life of the spirit, and this seems to be the difficulty which is expressed in Paul's words to the Corinthians.

Thruout His entire ministry Jesus refused to win men by force. In the parable of Dives and Lazarus, it is asserted that even tho the dead should return to life, men would not believe their words. So, for us, Paul remains the outstanding contemporary witness who testifies for the validity of his inner assurance. What Paul saw was under the influence of divine power. Today and thru the pages of history it has been this latter kind of vision - this inner consciousness - that has been the leaven of the Kingdom of God. Paul's vision left him in no doubt. Jesus' exaltation was as real to him as was the crucifixion. We do not for a moment doubt the testimony of this writer, but, with Denny, we feel we must weigh its meaning and value. In the first place, it is the resurrection of Jesus, not of Herod nor another. Nor was it the resurrection of the mere memory of Jesus, for He did not appear as they had known Him. As Professor Sheldon says in re-enforcing this truth, "The Resurrection of Christ is perfectly consonant with the unique character and extraordinary mission ascribed to Him by the New Testament in the whole trend of its teaching."

If Jesus was truly to be the Savior of men, his resurrection is a necessary part of so great a mission, and without this His life is incomplete. Neither natural science nor history can deny the resurrection except by claiming to exhaust the truth and reality of the universe. It appeals to men in a way in which a purely historical event cannot. It authenticates His mission and vindicates His claim to the utmost. By it God affixed His approval: "This is My beloved Son in whom I am well pleased: hear ye Him."

Paul states plainly that the body of Jesus was "buried" tho when he mentions it as again being raised, he is aware that all bodies are not of the same kind. When he speaks of Jesus' being "raised", he no doubt believes in a complete personal identity of that which arose with that which was buried. This, Lake indicates as a belief in a kind of transubstantiation of the body from the flesh and blood to the spirit. Such he thinks is the manner in which it was understood by this apsotle. Such is the "corruptible" putting on "incorruption" -as in Philippians 3:20-21 " -whence we shall look for the Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ: who shall change our vile body that it may be fashioned like unto His glorious body -" Such an idea of Paul was taken from Judaism very largely, but his distinct contribution is that the change was simultaneous with the resurrection -"in the twinkling of an eye." So Paul, in truth, bases his

belief finally on the knowledge he has of the event in the life of Christ. It is predominantly spiritual. In this apostle's mind there is no evident difference between this later and the earlier appearances. It was a sudden vision which convinced Paul that Jesus was still alive, and the interpretation of this vision is well set forth in Corinthians, i.e., that Christ was not flesh or blood. In this record of Paul, the chronology of the appearances is also vague and general, but the fact of them is beyond all question. The weight of Professor Sheldon's words is again brought to bear on this point: "While he (Paul) was furnished with substantial sources of information, he wrote under conditions which advised to carefulness and sobriety in his statements, for, in the third decade from the crucifixion, many of those to whom he referred as witnesses of the appearance of Christ must have been still at hand, as indeed he took pains to confirm." (System of Christian Doctrine, P. 586)

It was stated in the beginning of this paper that one's conclusion in this field is determined largely by the manner in which he approaches the subject. We have travelled thru the ordinary criticism of the question and have noted with some concern the many discrepancies in the accounts of the different eye-witnesses. These, however we have naturally attributed to the various authors. That the main issue is subscribed to alike by all the witnesses in a

matter of this kind, we have found sufficient for our purpose. The testimony of one of the moral potency and intellectual calibre of Paul has done much to mould our conclusions. Professor Lake's view conforms largely with that of this apostle - that the resurrection was that of the far greater kind, the spiritual reality of Jesus.

This survey of the field is profitable, but not the best approach of the great theme. From any angle in which we view the subject we see the hand of God. The resurrection was a miracle! This is precisely the element that the "modern" mind has difficulty with. Science, it is thought, opposes any occurence of events due to direct divine intervention. Such would be a disturbance of the unity of the whole system. Any system which excludes a living Personal God as the Author and Upholder of the world, must deny this miracle. Our approach, then, is the purely Christian view - that God rules events in this universe in which we live. Prof. Lake says,"Once postulate a God who has moral aims and over-rules causes and events, and it is hard to see why, for high ends of revelation and redemption, a supernatural economy should not be engrafted on the natural." * Huxley and J.S.Mill say there is no scientific impossibility to the miracle. It is a question of evidence upon which all "laws of nature" or "science" are based. A miracle is none other than the interposition of a new cause, as Bushnell says,

*(p. 277)

"wrought in accordance with a purpose." Thus a miracle is decidedly compatible with the idea of evolution which is so strongly held today.

In discussing the miracle of the resurrection in "The Essence of Religion", Professor Borden P. Bowne agrees fundamentally with our attitude toward this miracle of miracles. "The miracles of Christianity cannot be discussed piecemeal, but as parts of a system," says he (p.290). "Christianity affirms an ever-living, ever-working God," he further states. His position is that one's general conclusion in this subject cannot depend chiefly on argument alone, but also more fundamentally on one's world view and moral and religious sympathies and tendencies. If one is essentially irreligious, there is little use talking to him of the resurrection of Jesus for his mind is closed in advance. The real question here is not that of the many questions which we have raised, but primarily it is the strife between two views of life, the higher spiritual and the lower material. The higher view, like the idealistic philosophy, does not admit of any demonstration. Like the deepest things of life, it is a matter of faith. If we could have technical evidences to answer our historical inquiry, they would not be particularly edifying. Christianity is its own best evidence. If we understand that Christianity has always been deeply rooted in the divine,

we are prepared to believe anything which may fit into this magnificent conception. What could be more fitting than that He who revealed the love of the Father and was faithful even to death, should triumph over death and return to the Father. Professor Bowne's conclusions in the matter are that the appearances of Jesus were not made "in a corner", and that too much has come from them to suppose the faith fictitious. "If nothing had resulted," says he, "if there had been only a momentary flicker of enthusiasm, we might well believe that it is all a mistake." (p.297) To some this faith of the Christian will still be a stumbling block and foolishness; to others it must continue to be the power of God and the wisdom of God.

Finally, this conception of the over-ruling providence of God not only in the matter of the resurrection of Jesus for the redemption of mankind, but also in the power of this faith and its culture within the heart of man,-impels to a loftier view of the subject than that based purely on textual criticism. Denney believes that God would be ashamed to be the God of such a faith, unless He made good the hope of man. If righteousness, such as God's plainly was, is not finally victorious and finally eternal, where is our God! In such faith we are invited to accept the testimony of those who said,"We have seen the Lord"! The New Testament story, apart from the resurrection, would never have been manifested

in history. If the creed were to end - "Crucified, dead and buried," it would never have been passed on to this day.

The spiritual faith in Christ's unbroken communion with the Father has an irrefragible basis. It is significant that Jesus once quoted (Matthew 22:32) "I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob. God is not the God of the dead, but of the living." This fellowship of Jesus with His Father - from the very nature of God - is imperishable. Professor Denney indicates this necessary corallary to Christianity: If God is, then immortality is! Professor Orr; "Jesus, who came from God and went to God, has shed a flood of light into that unseen world which has vanquished its terrors and made it the bright home of every spiritual and eternal hope."* He further acknowledges that "the subject is full of mystery. The error lies in conceiving of the resurrection of the body of the Christian as necessarily the raising again of the very material form that was deposited in the grave."* But in regard to this Paul sets our minds at rest. 1 Corinthians 15 "Thou sowest not the body that shall be . . . But God giveth it a body as it pleaseth Him." 15:40 "There are bodies celestial, and bodies terrestrial."

* The Resurrection of Jesus p 286

SUMMARY

1. The best approach to the subject is from the fact that the resurrection was believed and preached by the early disciples and that it was a powerful factor before these Gospels with their conflicting narratives were ever reduced to writing. In addition to these remarkable phenomena of the origin of the Christian Church, we must consider also the remarkable course taken by Christianity since that early day.

2. Even a cursory survey of the material of the Gospels shows that the early Church, and even those who were the first witnesses of a resurrected Christ, believed that a miracle had been wrought for their faith, and that the resurrection of the Lord was in His physical form.

3. The evidence of St. Paul, on the other hand, is the earliest and the most reliable of our written sources. This apostle embodied in all his works not only that which he had learned thru conversation with others, but also his own personal experience. His records are also independent of the other sources of information.

4. A detailed and critical study of the Synoptics shows that the various resurrection narratives do not fully agree even in some rather broad considerations. The records of Matthew and Luke are plainly based fundamentally on the underlying material and formation of Mark. This leads us with Allen and Burkett to repose faith in an "Ur Marcus", from which the other narratives are plainly developments.

5. The denial of any early assurance of the empty tomb by Professor Lake is untenable. The belief of the first Christians must at least imply the empty tomb. Lake's general approval of the Pauline belief is acceptable, however, for this apostle based his evidence, not on the empty tomb, but on the manifestations of Christ Himself.

6. The unimpeachable evidence seems to be for the empty tomb - as advocated by Simpson, Holtzmann, and others. If the testimony of the experience of the apostles, who returned from their old tasks at Galilee and won thousands of converts to their belief, is worth any consideration, the tomb must have been vacated. Otherwise, enemies of the new cause would easily have frustrated the enthusiastic work of these disciples.

7. Whatever our view of this complex question, we must inevitably rise above the inadequacies of these first reports. It is not the nature of the resurrected body which is of most importance at the grave; it is rather the conception we there find of God. The Appearances were the means of

BOSTON UNIVERSITY

GRADUATE SCHOOL

THESIS

"THE HISTORICITY OF THE RESURRECTION OF JESUS"

submitted by

PERCY MERRIMAN HICKCOX

(A.B. Ohio Wesleyan University, 1918)
(S.T.B. Boston University, 1921)

In partial fulfilment of requirements for

the degree of Master of Arts

1922

Jesus Christ - Resurrection and ascension

Title

the disciple's faith, but a true conclusion may be reached by mistaken premises. At any rate, the exaltation of Jesus may be considered independentlyof the particulars of this event.

8. There is undoubted value in something of a mystery at this point. Mere historical evidence alone will not lead to faith in a resurrected Christ; one's interpretation must be determined by a judgment of worth. That "Christ lives" is the central message of all these resurrection records, and the Appearances are plainly supplementary to this supreme evidence.

9. At all events, the risen Body of the Lord had undergone a change. Tho this transition had taken plane, the appearance of Jesus must have been either in a very objective fashion before the eyes of the disciples, or, if it were of a higher form, they could have interpreted such a vision in none other than a sensuous manner. Tho these disciples could not have been orthodox in any other view, Paul rejects such for a daring "spiritual view".

10. The naturalistic and psychological theories of some few scholars are favorable only in their apparent explanation of the physical appearances of the Risen Lord, but at best they are fundamentally unworthy of belief and grossly unsound *in that they take no account of the facts of religious life*.

11. If we should take away from history the death with the accompanying resurrection of Jesus, we would beyond all doubt possess wonderful memoirs of His life, but the living stream of vital influence from that Life must indicate that He lives today thru the faith the early Church had in the resurrection. The primary evidence of the past is forever closed, but the assurance which men have still of the resurrected Christ cannot be discarded. The message of Easter alone can account for the power manifested thru the preaching of Peter and Paul.

12. Finally, one's conclusion depends on one's religious attitude toward the whole universe and its interpretation. The ultimate principle of life is one of faith; it cannot be demonstrated by any amount of argument. If one believes in the over-ruling providence of God, a matter of so great moment as the theme of this paper readily fits into one's total experience of life. In the last analysis, Christianity must be its own best evidence.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Resurrection Of Jesus — James Orr
(Eaton and Mains, N.Y. - 1908)

Jesus and the Gospels — James D. Denny
(A.C. Armstrong and Son, N.Y.)

Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible
IV. p. 234 ff.; I 754 f. (Salmond)
IV. 233 ff.; I 751 f. "
IV. 234 ff.; I 487 f. (Robertson)

The Proofs of the Resurrection — Charles R. Morrison
(Andover, Warren F. Draper - 1882 pp. 1-134)

The First Interpreters of Jesus — George Holley Gilbert
(MacMillian Co. - N.Y. 1901 - Part II pp. 215-301)

The Resurrection of Jesus — Kirsopp Lake
(Willaims and Norgate, London; G.P. Putnam's Son, N.Y.) (date not printed)

The Philosophy and Development of Religion — Otto Pfleiderer
(Gifford Lectures - 1894, Vol. II, lectures 8-10)
G.P. Putnam's Sons, N.Y.

Christian Doctrine — Henry C. Sheldon
(Revised Edition, The Methodist Book Concern, N.Y pp. 561 f.) 1903

Tertullian Against Marcion — (translated by Peter Holmes)
(T.and T. Clark, 38 George St., Edinburgh, 1870 pp. 412-424)

The Apostolic Fathers Vol. I. — (translated by Roberts and Donaldson)
(T.and T. Clark, 38 George St., Edinburgh, 1873, pp. 26-241)

The Life and Teachings of Jesus — Charles Foster Kent
(Charles Scribner's Sons, N.Y., Published Feb. 1913, pp. 288-310)
Boston, Mass.

What is Christianity? — Adolph Harnack
(2nd edition, Translated by T.B. Saunders, Lectures in Berlin in 1900. G.P. Putnam's Sons, N.Y. Part II The Gospel in History pp. 164-287)

The Appearances of Our Lord — Henry Barclay Swete
(MacMillan and Co., Limited.St. Martin's St. London - 1907)

The Risen Master — Henry Latham
(Deighton, Bell and Co. 1907 (7th Thousand)

The Resurrection in the New Testament — Clayton R. Bowen
(G.P. Putnam's Sons, N.Y. and London, Knickerbocker Press, 1911)

The Resurrection of Christ — John Mackintosh Shaw
(T. and T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1920)

The Resurrection of Our Lord — William Milligan
(MacMillan and Co., London, 1884 (2nd Thousand) 2nd edition)

The Essence of Religion — Borden P. Bowne
(Houghton, Mifflin Co., The Riverside Press, Cambridge - 1910)

The Diviner Immanence — Francis J. Mc Connell
(Eaton and Mains p. 34 f)

Studies in Christianity — Borden P. Bowne
(Houghton, Mifflin, Co., The Riverside Press, Cambridge - 1909. pp. 327-399)

The Life of Jesus — Oscar Holtzmann
(Adam and Charles Black, London, 1924 pp. 392-529)

The Resurrection in Modern Thought — W.J. S. Simpson
(Longmans, Green, and Co., N.Y. 1911, pp. 1-227)

Christian Faith In An Age Of Sceince — William N. Rice
(Hodder and Stroughton, George H. Doran Co., N.Y. 3d edition) 1904

Where pages, lectures, chapters, etc. are not specifically mentioned, the whole book has been used.

Percy M. Hickcox

BOSTON UNIVERSITY
1 1719 02480 2540